

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 7, 14, and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5 and 8-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment claims 1-5, 8-9, 18, and 21-22 have been amended and claims 6-7 have been canceled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-25, and 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-25, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “A Technical Introduction to PCI-Based RS/6000 Servers,” 1996 to IBM (hereinafter “IBM”). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a reference. (MPEP §2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id. citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of claim 7 into independent claims 1, 9, 18, and 21. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although Applicants believe claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 are patentable as written, in the interest of expediting prosecution Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 to include the subject matter of claims 6-7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8/21/2006

Jan Little-Washington

Reg. No. 41,181

(206) 292-8600

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

on August 21, 2006
Date of Transmission

Yuko Tanaka

Name of Person Transmitting Paper

Y. Tanaka

Signature

8-21-06

Date